

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment amends Claim 4 to clarify the claimed invention and cancels Claims 1-3. Claims 4-6 are currently pending in this application. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that the rejections should be withdrawn and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publication No. JP2001-088430 to Ota (“Ota”). In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), a reference must disclose each and every element of a claim. As discussed below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4

Amended Claim 4 clarifies that THE indicator panel is for a vehicle “having means for throwing backlight onto indicia on the indicator panel” and includes “a printed layer printed on a portion of the ink-acceptance layer, wherein the printed layer includes a black or colored ink so as to shield the backlight” and “a transparent portion on another portion of the ink-acceptance layer, wherein the transparent portion is not printed with the black or colored ink so that the backlight illuminates the indicia.” Figure 2 illustrates the printed layer and the transparent portion for one embodiment, which is described on page 8, line 25 thru page 9, line 16 of the specification.

With respect to Claim 4, Ota lacks one or more features of the claimed invention. Ota discloses an ink jet recording material capable of preventing bronzing, without reducing the lightfastness of a color. [0007]. The ink jet material may be comprised of “an ink absorbing layer” [0011] and a “film transparent or opaque” can be used as a base material.” [0018]. An ink jet printer is used to print on the ink jet recording material. [0026].

The Examiner alleged paragraph [0018] of Ota which describes a “film transparent or opaque as a base material” describes the claimed “base substrate having transparency.” However, none of the cited sections of the detailed description of Ota describe “a transparent portion on another portion of the ink-acceptance layer, wherein the transparent portion is not

printed with the black or colored ink so that the backlight illuminates the indicia” as required by Claim 4.

The Examiner cited paragraph [0026] of Ota which describes printing on the ink jet recording material as describing the claimed “printed layer.” However, none of the cited sections of the detailed description of Ota describe “a printed layer printed on a portion of the ink-acceptance layer, wherein the printed layer includes a black or colored ink so as to shield the backlight” as required by Claim 4.

Although Ota discloses an ink jet recording material comprised of an ink absorbing layer and a film transparent or opaque as a base material, it does not disclose or suggest anything that encompasses “a printed layer” on one portion of the ink-acceptance layer and “a transparent portion” on another portion of the ink-acceptance layer, as recited in Claim 4. Ota does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention as recited in Claim 4. None of the corresponding sections of the detailed description of Ota cited by the Examiner show otherwise. Thus Claim 4 is patentable over Ota and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6

Claims 5 and 6 depend directly from independent Claims 4. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons discussed above, Claims 5 and 6 are patentable over Ota.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,977,219 to Ravichandran *et. al* (“Ravichandran”) in view of Ota. For at least the following reasons, the Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration and withdrawal thereof.

Claim 4

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Ravichandran fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 4. Specifically, Ravichandran does not disclose the benzotriazole UV absorbers recited in Claim 4. Although Ravichandran discloses benzotriazole UV absorbers, the benzotriazole UV absorbers do not have the claimed properties. Ravichandran describes that the benzotriazole UV absorbers are incorporated into automotive coatings.

[2:25-27]. Automotive coatings are those coatings commonly understood to be on the exterior of an automobile.

Ravichandran also discloses recording materials suitable for pressure-sensitive copying systems, photocopying systems using microcapsules, heat-sensitive copying systems, photographic materials and ink jet printing. [13:20-23]. Ravichandran discloses benzotriazole UV absorbers in an external coating on a vehicle or in recording materials.

The Examiner admitted that Ravichandran does not disclose the claimed benzotriazole UV absorbers, but alleged that Ota describes the claimed benzotriazole UV absorbers, and alleged that both references are directed to the prevention of bronzing. As described herein, neither Ravichandran nor Ota describes an indicator panel for a vehicle “having means for throwing backlight onto indicia on the indicator panel” including “a printed layer printed on a portion of the ink-acceptance layer, wherein the printed layer includes a black or colored ink so as to shield the backlight” and “a transparent portion on another portion of the ink-acceptance layer, wherein the transparent portion is not printed with the black or colored ink so that the backlight illuminates the indicia” as recited by Claim 4. Even if the references are combined, the combined teachings of the references do not suggest the invention of Claim 4 since neither reference describes a printed portion on one portion of the ink-acceptance layer and a transparent portion on another portion of the ink-acceptance layer.

Therefore, the Examiner has failed to show that Ravichandran in view of Ota teaches or suggests to those of ordinary skill in the art the claimed structural features of Claim 4. Thus Claim 4 is patentable over Ravichandran in view of Ota and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 6

Claims 5 and 6 depend directly from independent Claim 4. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons discussed above, Claims 5 and 6 are patentable over Ravichandran in view Ota.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes/

By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555